



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,984	12/06/2004	Petrus Gijbertus Maria Centen	PF020062	1382
7590 Joseph S Tripoli Patent Operations Thomson Licensing Inc PO Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/516,984

Applicant(s)

CENTEN, PETRUS GIJSBERTUS MARIA

Examiner

LUONG T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/06/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species I, Figure 1 readable on claims 1-15 in the reply filed on 07/07/2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the generic invention of claim 1 is applicable for different types of CCD or CMOS imagers, and that the type of CCD image sensor is irrelevant to the finding of the invention that instead of using 575 vertical lines of PAL standard 576 line may be used, because it is irrelevant where the combination of the charges is effected. This is not found persuasive because of the following reasons.

The application contains claim directed to more than one species of the generic invention.

Species I (Figure 1) discloses a CCD device of the frame transfer type for a camera head comprises a control circuit 4, which provides the bias voltages to the electrodes in the portions 2, 3 of the CCD by reference number 6, which is not disclosed in Figure 6 (Species II) or Figure 7 (Species III).

Species II (Figure 6) discloses a frequency divider 11, which is not disclosed in Species I (Figure 1) or Species III (Figure 7).

Species III (Figure 7) discloses an interline CCD, which is not disclosed in Species I (Figure 1) or Species II (Figure 6).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 16-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 07/07/2008.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" should be avoided. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

6. Claims 4-12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 (line 2), "element lines formed of light-insensitive elements" should be changed to --the plurality of element lines formed of the light-insensitive elements--.

Claim 5 (line 5), "said column" should be changed to --said columns--.

Claim 5 (line 6), "the shift register" should be changed to --the at least shift register--.

Claim 12 (line 2), "number is" should be changed to --number of light-sensitive elements is--.

Claim 6-12 are objected as being dependent on claim 5.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-4, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Centen et al. (A Multiformat HDTV Camera Head, SMPTE Journal, August 2001).

Regarding claim 1, Centen et al. discloses camera head comprising a light-sensor array having light-sensitive elements arranged in a plurality of element lines (frame transfer imager, figure 1, page 512), element readout means to said light-sensor array for outputting a signal representative of a quantity of light received by elements of a number of contiguous element lines (frame transfer imager, figure 1, page 512), in that wherein said readout means is adapted to selectively set the number of element lines to $5n$ or $6n$, n being an integer (Centen et al.

discloses that 6 lines combining is defined in Table 2 and a 3x6 lines combining defines the NTSC, it is considered that a 480 line format defines the NTSC, i.e., Centen et al. discloses the 6n lines combining, page 511, right column).

Regarding claim 2, Centen et al. discloses wherein the number of element lines is 1440 or an integer multiple thereof (Centen et al. discloses combines three pixels at a time $3 \times 1440 = 4320$ results in 1440 element lines, page 511, right column).

Regarding claim 3, Centen et al. discloses wherein the light-sensor array is a charge-coupled device (CCD imager, figure 1, page 512, left column)

Regarding claim 4, Centen et al. discloses wherein the light sensor array further comprises element lines formed of light-insensitive elements (figure 1, page 511, right column).

Regarding claim 14, see Examiner's comment regarding claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Centen et al. (A Multiformat HDTV Camera Head, SMPTE Journal, August 2001).

Regarding claim 13, Centen et al. does not explicitly disclose wherein the light sensor array is a CMOS device. However, Centen et al. disclose the light sensor is a CCD imager (figure 1, page 512, left column). Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art to use the light sensor is a CMOS device since the CMOS device has advantage of lower cost and smaller size than a CCD device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use CMOS device as a light sensor since the CMOS device has advantage of lower cost and smaller size than a CCD device.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Centen et al. (A Multiformat HDTV Camera Head, SMPTE Journal, August 2001) in view of Parulski (WO 92/20187).

Regarding claim 15, Centen et al. discloses a method of obtaining an NTSC image signal as discussed in claims 1 and 14. Centen et al. does not disclose a method of obtaining a PAL or SECAM signal. However, Parulski discloses the PAL-B color television standard employs approximately 575 active lines, instead of the 484 active lines used in NTSC, figure 3, page 5, lines 29-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Centen et al. by the teaching of Parulski in order to obtain a video camera which has the capability of processing output signals for displaying on a monitor either as PAL or NTSC signals (abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 5-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID L. OMETZ can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LTN
10/25/08

/LUONG T NGUYEN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2622